

Remarks

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above referenced case on June 29, 2005, made final. Claims 1-28 are presented below for examination. The Examiner rejects claims 1-2 and 12-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg et al. (U.S. 6,360,332) hereinafter Weinberg. Claims 3-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg in view of W3C of record. Applicant has carefully studied the prior art presented by the Examiner in this case, and the Examiner's rejections and statements of the instant office Action.

In response, applicant believes that the prior art cited and applied by the Examiner in rejection of applicant's base claims, is inadequate to reject the independent claims in their present unamended form. Applicant provides argument below detailing such advantageous distinctions of applicant's claimed invention over that of the prior art presented, clearly demonstrating that the teachings in the prior art presented, taking either singly or in combination, fail to meet the criteria for an obviousness rejection.

The Examiner states in his rejection of claim 1 that Weinberg teaches an interface for enabling users to build and modify network navigation and interaction templates using functional logic blocks (column 2, lines 25-35; columns 9-10, lines 48-23), for navigating to and interacting with interactive electronic information pages (columns 9-10, lines 48-22: "web site"; column 14, lines 39-41).

Applicant argues that Weinberg teaches a testing method for servers, not applied structural changes to electronic information pages, as claimed. Weinberg teaches testing transactional servers by inputting various data requests into appropriate interfaces at transactional server hosted Web sites in order to check the results returned from the server for accuracy and to make sure the transactional server is functioning properly. Weinberg achieves this by recording a user navigation process to the Web site and also records user activity within the Web site, i.e. hyperlink initiation, form submittals etc.. The test developed by Weinberg tests to see if the hyperlinks produce the correct result and the form submittal is processed correctly by the server.

Applicant points out that if the fields have changed on the form from the last submittal, or the placement of a hyperlink has moved on the Web page interface, then Weinberg's testing method cannot proceed without re-recording the entire navigational process described in columns 9-10. There is no facility in Weinberg to modify network navigation using functional logic blocks, as claimed. Weinberg's fatal flaw is that he does not account for structural Web changes in his process. Weinberg's testing is only successful if the structure of the Web site remains in tact.

Specifically, column 10 of Weinberg describes how exactly the recording process detects where items are, for example "text checks" and "image checks" have detailed accounts of where these items are, and how to look for them on a Web site. If they have moved structurally, within the Web site then the "Tree steps for Web Based Implementation Tables" must be re-recorded and created each time a change occurs.

Applicant argues that Weinberg does not teach or suggest a capability to build and modify network navigation and interaction templates using functional logic blocks. The WC3 reference may teach an automated process of logging in and site registration, but neither Weinberg, or WC3 teach site logic blocks for navigation wherein structural changes of Web sites are detected and modified.

Referring now to applicant's Fig. 11, and description in the specification beginning on page 54, a method and apparatus is provided for detecting the changes or updates to Web sites and affecting efficient and timely creation and repairs to the instruction templates, which are used for proxy navigation to and interaction with the Web sites. Applicant's invention teaches creating "dummy", or test templates by virtue of software executing at computer stations 247,249 and 251 of Fig 11, which direct the navigation to and interaction with the electronic information pages. The test, or "dummy" routines, or scripts, may execute simultaneously with real, or actual routines, and actually simulate a user registering to, logging into, or otherwise interfacing with an interactive electronic information page, in this case a Web site. Changes and updates in the architecture of the Web site which caused the test (or real) script to fail somewhere in the

session attempt, are monitored and detected, which could include changes affecting navigation to and/or interaction with an interactive Web site. In this way the developers may quickly, even in real-time, affect the repairs to the navigation and interaction templates based on the detected changes of the architecture of the electronic page subjected to the test session.

Applicant argues that, although a change in the Web site architecture being tested by Weinberg may create a failure notice, there is absolutely no feature taught or suggested in Weinberg for a developer to correct "or modify" the problem with functional logic blocks, as claimed. Weinberg must re-record a new navigation sequence performed by a user.


Regarding claim 18, steps (f) and (g) recite creating new logic according to the source information and according to information contained in the recorded instance; and installing the new logic into existing navigation templates that depend on the updated information for successful function.

As argued above, Weinberg fails to teach or suggest such a capability. Applicant's independent claim 12 is for a change-notification system for detecting structural changes applied to electronic information pages hosted on a data-packet-network. As argued above, Weinberg is not concerned with Web page structural changes. Weinberg tests for functional server failures.

Applicant believes that it has been clearly demonstrated that the reference of Weinberg fails as a primary reference in substantially teaching or suggesting the key and patentable limitations of applicant's base claims as argued above. Weinberg lacks sufficient teaching and motivation for producing or suggesting all of the features and capabilities of applicant's invention, as embodied in the independent claims. The WC3 reference also fails to teach a site logic module as claimed. Claims 1, 12 and 18 are therefore clearly and unarguably patentable over the references provided by the Examiner. Claims 2-11, 13-17 and 19-28 are all depending claims, which are then patentable on their own merits, or at least has depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims standing for examination have been shown to be patentable as amended over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
Tim Armandpour et al.

by 
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Donald R. Boys
Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(831) 726-1457